

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: increase in nonrefundable fees

**From:** Koistinen, Kelly -FS [<mailto:kkoistinen@fs.fed.us>]

**Sent:** Friday, October 03, 2014 9:49 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** increase in nonrefundable fees

Again? Here we go again. Constantly changing the fees on one thing or another to cover the costs of something! Every time I see these increases in fees, it boils my blood. We are now paying \$45 / single deer tag, when you used to be able to get an antlerless and an any deer tag for the same amount. I want to pay \$25/tag! The commission is constantly wanting to increase our fees of one thing or another. I am sick and tired of your increasing my privilege as a South Dakota Resident to enjoy outdoor recreation! Residents of this state are being bludgeoned by the increases in fees. Just go back to the minutes of commission meetings in the past 4 or 5 years and look at the number of fee increases you've put in front of us. It seems like all the commission wants to do is increase the money intake at the expense of the citizens of this state. When does it end? How about spending less? If the Game, Fish, & Parks wants more money, then my belief is you should charge more money to the nonresidents that come into this state. We can't even afford to enjoy the outdoors anymore! The cost of the elk, sheep, and goats are the three most expensive tags already! We don't even have a chance to hunt goats anymore because we haven't even had a season in the last 5 years. I am totally against any increases in fees! Please stop with the increases in fees. I have never been able to afford a hunt in another state, now you will drive South Dakotans to have to stop hunting here because we won't be able to afford it before long. Seriously, just go back and look at the minutes of all the increases that have happened to us in the last 15 years. Thanks for your time. [Kelly Koistinen, Spearfish, SD](#)

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:**

Proposed Change to Elk Application Fee

**From:** "Mlueb96@aol.com" <mlueb96@aol.com>

**Date:** October 3, 2014 at 8:19:49 AM MDT

**To:** <Emily.Kiel@state.sd.us>

**Subject: Proposed Change to Elk Application Fee**

Hi Emily,

Thanks for the email asking for public input. I tried to call the phone number listed in email but it was only a recording and no messages could be left. I have been applying for 6 different elk tags each year (archery, early, late, in & out of park, etc.) Although I have spent over \$200 to accumulated over 40 preference points, I'm not holding my breath on chances of drawing a tag until numbers rebound and tags increase.

If I read correctly GFP is considering doubling our fee from \$5 to \$10. I have no problem with reduced tags until those elk numbers come back. I do have a problem with doubling the application fee to the public when our chances are so slim of drawing. If the fee doubles, and I live long enough to continue to not draw tags, I will have spent \$400 more with still no tag. I may be wise to more seriously consider applying for and receiving an "out of state tag" and give up on what I now almost consider a donation to SD GFP. I encourage GFP to seriously ask if this is the right time to double our application fee. When numbers are up and chances are improved of getting a tag, I would be much more willing to pay \$10 for a chance to draw.

Thanks for asking for and considering our input. If you have any questions or want to discuss further please give me a call. 594-6653. Thanks

Martin Luebke  
Garretson SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** Fee increase - Elk, Sheep application

**From:** Lavin, Matt [<mailto:Matt.Lavin@SanfordHealth.org>]

**Sent:** Friday, October 03, 2014 9:07 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Fee increase - Elk, Sheep application

I have absolutely no problem with an increase in the processing fee for Big Game applications. We have gotten by for a very long time with minimal fees and as a hunter I have appreciated that. What I would like to comment on is the statement that this additional fee will be used to help manage these species. Again, I am all for this! Elk numbers are abysmal, there are no mt goats, and sheep have not appreciably increased even with the efforts of the GFP. I will gladly pay the extra fee if the fee will be truly applied to helping these species! That means that this would be ADDITIONAL funding for this, not replacement of dollars that could now be used for something else. The last year I drew an elk tag (cow) for CSP there were 40 bull tags and 80 cows for in the park. What the hell has happened out there? With the current management practices I will never see a legitimate chance, even with the 20 pref points I have, of ever getting my in the park bull tag.

Please just use the money as you have stated you will and without a decrease on the other side of the ledger.

Sincerely,

Matt Lavin  
1423 Crestview  
Vermillion, SD 57069

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:**

Comment on Increase in fees for Elk, Bighorn, & Mt Goat

**From:** Jason Schuldt [<mailto:jasknx@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 02, 2014 9:46 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Comment on Increase in fees for Elk, Bighorn, & Mt Goat

Dear SD GF&P-

I Love our state, and the hunting here is very good most of the time. I moved to Wyoming for work in 2001 and was sure the big game hunting would be better, but once I had been there for a year, I couldn't wait to get back home. That being said, I am against the raising of resident application fees for elk, bighorn, and Mt Goat. First off, it seems inflation is everywhere around us, but paychecks sure aren't going up. For one person the increase could be about \$40, but when you include the whole family (because we do want to keep introducing children and non-hunters to the sport) it counts up faster. Secondly, I think anything that encourages someone not to participate is against the mission of GF&P. Third, I am against using the money for depredation losses. I participated in a deer hunt on a ranch that had a depredation claim a while back, and the rancher was bragging about all the money he charged for people to hunt there during the season, but when I asked him what he did to keep from having a problem, he told me that the state should take care of paying for his loss. Maybe he should allow some hunting access for free to somebody (the disabled, kids, women, antlerless hunters, or whoever) to scare some of the animals off his place instead of taking money for access and then expecting the state to pay him also for depredation? Thanks -

Jason Schuldt of Spearfish, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:**

FW: FW:

-----Original Message-----

From: Carda, Joe

Sent: Friday, October 03, 2014 7:43 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject:

Here is the problem I have with this \$10.00 increase: First and foremost this is a way to pay for Game Fish and Parks screw up. Fifteen years ago hunters complained about the cougar population and wanted something done about it but you agency continue to deny there were that many cougars in South Dakota and some cases even denied that there were cougars in South Dakota and if there was a cougar it was just passing through. I asked a so called expert on this matter in Yankton at a meeting and he stated that cougars don't even like elk, that they would rather eat a deer. Not much of an expert.

The biggest problem I really have is applying for 15 years for Prairie elk, 10 years for Black Hills elk and another 8 years for Custer park elk and still have not gotten a license. I am not much of a mathematician but I think I paid enough fees. Total \$165.00. This is not counting the numerous other tags that I apply for and paid \$5.00 for.

But I am willing to compromise and ok the extra \$10.00 IF: all the hunters that have received an elk license in the past can no longer apply for another elk license. Also land owners can only apply every two years if they received a license in the past year. I am tired of hearing and seeing individuals who have elk tags Nine years ago and by some kind of miracle get another tag when they apply.

You can chalk up that this as just another upset, paranoid hunter but then again how can anyone believe that this money is really going to help the elk herd when you give out free elk licenses to out of state hunters like Governor Janklow did? L Joseph J Carda Tabor, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: RASING RATES TO 10.00

-----Original Message-----

From: Sioux Falls Ford Parts Dept [<mailto:parts7@siouxfallsford.com>]

Sent: Monday, October 06, 2014 11:11 AM

To: SDGFPINFO

Subject: RASING RATES TO 10.00

I'm not for raising the fee to 10.00. I think we need to work on getting the amount of wildlife to hunt up. If we did that then you folks would get full price of the license. Right now for example I started hunting the hill 36 years ago we use to buy over the counter. Then we went to drawing still would get a tag every year. Now it takes 2 to 3 years and at that rate we would 50 to 60 dollars in a tag. You folks went from 8000 tags a year to a little over 3000. We need to get the number of wildlife backup. Raising fees will not do it. The small towns and everbody would gain on it if the number of tags came back up. Thanks Dick Klinger Hartford SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Application Fee Increase Comment

---

**From:** dakotacare.com, sjamison  
**Sent:** Friday, October 10, 2014 1:19 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Application Fee Increase Comment

Hi guys, re the increase from \$5 to \$10. I guess I can see it for rifle elk, that is the one most people want and can realistically get someday. For the other three the odds are so long I would leave them at \$5.

It also occurs to me that if the need is for depredation costs, perhaps you could issue more elk licenses and let people shoot more elk.

Thanks

Scott Jamison, Wentworth, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:**

FW: FW:

**From:** David Bechard [[mailto:david\\_bechard2000@yahoo.com](mailto:david_bechard2000@yahoo.com)]

**Sent:** Friday, October 03, 2014 7:38 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:**

Wow GFP is just as money hungry and restrictive as the rest of our government. More laws and restriction every time you people have a meeting. Where are the freedoms we once had? All taken away by government you should be real proud. Not saying you don't do some good thing but the bad outnumber the good...

David Bechard, Pierre, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** Application Fee Increase for certain big game

**From:** rich nelson [mailto:richard.l.nelson@sio.midco.net]

**Sent:** Friday, October 17, 2014 2:04 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Application Fee Increase for certain big game

To increase the application fee for me to have my name tossed in a hat to try to get an Elk tag, and for which I have less than a one in a thousand chance of ever getting my name drawn to make me eligible to buy a tag **before I die** is very disheartening to say the least. I've been loyally applying for a long while; I've contributed my Elk applications for about 12 or 13 years, I've paid in \$5.00 per year, so I've paid in around \$60.00 or \$70.00 and have nothing to show for it except a sheet of paper which says I've got 12 or 13 preference points. To all of a sudden, up the anti, is not right.

If you want to up the anti, do so **for new applicants only**, and **for out of staters**, not for the loyal South Dakota hunter who has been loyally paying into your system with the hopes of his name being drawn for the past 14 years, and in many cases, even longer than that. Another approach would be to **grandfather in those applicants 65 or older**, providing they have previously been participating in the lottery drawing.

If the GFP needs money so badly, they should be looking at different sources, rather than the elderly, who probably comprise a great deal of the applicants, because they feel that sooner or later their name will be drawn, but in my case it has not been so.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Nelson  
2417 E. Marson Drive  
Sioux Falls, SD 57103

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: raising fees

**From:** Robert Koski [<mailto:bobkoski74@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, October 06, 2014 11:01 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** raising fees

I think your thinking is wrong on the continual raising of fees to make up for lack of revenue for bad number counts on deer, elk, pronghorns, and pheasants. The swelling of the department size has made it so you are relying on the numbers to stay up to make ends meet. When times are tough people need to CUT BACK!

Bob Koski, Spearfish, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Increase

-----Original Message-----

From: Chuck Schroder [<mailto:ecschroder@alliancecom.net>]

Sent: Friday, October 03, 2014 11:59 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Increase

I feel this is a fair increase as long as the it goes back into the GFP dept.

Chuck Schroder, Brandon, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: big-game license

**From:** larry [<mailto:grizzlyrhodes2@msn.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 23, 2014 11:11 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Subject:** RE: big-game license

My name is Larry Rhodes I live in Nemo S.D. was born in Rapid City S.D. and been here all my life

---

**From:** Larry Rhodes [<mailto:grizzlyrhodes2@msn.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 12, 2014 10:59 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Cc:** [grizzlyrhodes2@msn.com](mailto:grizzlyrhodes2@msn.com)  
**Subject:** big-game license

I would like to suggest that retired people 62 older be sold a license for deer and other big-game without being put in the lottery. I'm 72 and was looking forward to be able to hunt at my leisure after I retired, I have not got a deer license in the last three years. I don't know how much longer I will be physically able to walk and hunt game. I did not get to the meeting in Sturgis was unaware of it. I have hunted these hills for 60 years starting with my dad and it would be nice to hunt until I'm unable. I would just like to have this subject brought up to see if we could get license in our older years to hunt. Sincerely yours Larry

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Spring 2015 Black Hills Turkey Season

**From:** Scott Kuck [<mailto:kucklaw@nvc.net>]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 10, 2014 2:22 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Cc:** [jlcoop11@aol.com](mailto:jlcoop11@aol.com)  
**Subject:** Spring 2015 Black Hills Turkey Season

Dear Commission Members: I am writing to comment on the proposed spring 2015 Black Hills turkey season. First, I would like to commend the G,F & P and the Commission on the closure of the fall turkey season in the northern and western Black Hills. Our family and friends have been turkey hunting in the Moon-Summit Ridge area of the western Black Hills for the past 30+ years. The turkey population in that area has been severely reduced in the past 10 or so years. So much so that I have not harvested a bird the past two seasons, and my father did not harvest a bird for the first time in over 30 years last year. The birds just aren't there anymore. I cannot speak to the other areas that were closed this fall, but my understanding from speaking with others around the state is that the number of birds is down considerably in those areas as well which prompted the fall closure. The Spring Harvest survey for 2014 shows a steady decline in overall numbers of hunters and harvest in the Hills as well. Hunter satisfaction has steadily fallen also.

With that in mind, I would like to express my opposition to allowing the taking of a second turkey by resident hunters in the area that was closed this fall in the Hills. I am not opposed to allowing the second license to residents, but I believe that we need to give these birds an extended time frame—a number of years-- to build their numbers again in the closed area. Nothing is going to change between this fall and next spring in the closed area, and so it seems counterproductive to me to allow two birds to be taken by one individual in that closed area next spring.

My suggestion is to make the Black Hills Turkey tags similar to archery deer licenses where you can get one statewide any deer tag or one tag for east river and one tag for west river. With the turkey tags you would be allowed one tag for the entire Hills unit that is good for the entire season. Residents would still be allowed the second tag during the May portion of the season. **However, you would also be limited to hunting the second turkey in the area of the Hills that was open this fall.** If the hunter simply wanted the May season tag, he or she could get only that tag, but would be limited in time and area as listed above.

We absolutely must give these turkeys time to rebuild their numbers in the closed area of the Hills. It has always seemed odd to me that we have units for most other big game species in South Dakota, but the entire Black Hills was open to turkey hunting. The Black Hills is very diverse in its habitat across different sections of the Hills, and the turkey numbers are greater on the eastern and southern portions of the Hills due to lower elevation and relatively easier winter conditions at the lower elevations. Making turkey units across different sections of the Black Hills is something that I believe needs to be looked at in the near future—similar to our elk units and the prairie turkey units. Turkeys are a great resource, but they need to be managed more carefully I believe. Especially in the Black Hills.

I hope that you will give serious consideration to my suggestion on next spring's turkey season regarding the limitation on the second tag for resident hunters. It is a very fair and I believe it is the best way to help the birds that need limited hunting pressure while still giving residents that opportunity at a second bird if they so choose.

Thank you for your time and dedication to our great state's wildlife resources.

Sincerely,  
Scott T. Kuck, Kuck Law Office  
428 N. Hwy. 281, Ste. #3, Aberdeen, SD 57401

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**From:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Sent:** Monday, September 29, 2014 1:50 PM  
**To:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Subject:** Comment on : GFP 2014 August Proposals - 2014 October Finals

Name: tom braun

Address: po box 1213

City: hot springs

State: sd

Zip: 57747

Email: [coyowood@hotmail.com](mailto:coyowood@hotmail.com)

Phone: 745-3142

Comment: I don't see any details on the proposed turkey baiting, therefore: Fall turkey season was canceled or limited due to low populations over most of the state. So is it just my opinion that to follow up with baiting is insanity, or are there others that agree w/me? You've already reduced equipment restrictions for archery and allowed more "tech" resulting in making what used to be "archery season" so easy that it is now just a SHOOTING SEASON. Now baiting is needed to make it still easier? PLEASE, NO BAITING OF ANY WILDLIFE!! By the way, you should all tune in to the HUNTING PORN programs on TV and get an education. The promoters of "tech" for profit in shooting seasons, whom you have been catering to, no longer use the term "bait"! It's now called "ATTRACTANT"! It sounds better than the truth.

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Baiting

**From:** Jason Nope [<mailto:jasonnope@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 22, 2014 5:53 PM

**To:** Ascher, Debra

**Subject:** Re: Baiting

Hello, I live in rapid city, sd.

I just can't think of any reason why baiting should be illegal. Deer eat spilled grain by nature, than why not put there by man?

Thanks for your attention ,

Jason Nope

---

**From:** Jason Nope [<mailto:jasonnope@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 09, 2014 11:12 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Baiting

I believe baiting SHOULD BE allowed.

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**From:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Sent:** Monday, October 13, 2014 7:08 PM  
**To:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Subject:** Comment on : GFP 2014 October Proposals - 2014 November Finals

Name: Tim Larson

Address:

City: Centerville

State: SD

Zip: 57014

Email:

Phone:

Comment: I recently read the proposal to raise the catfish limit on the neb. s.d. border waters, I would like to see the limit stay the same. I fish the springfield and vermilion areas, the size of the catfish are finally getting bigger since neb. can't use nets anymore. I have many times caught five 7 to 10lbs catfish I keep one or two for eating throw the rest back,In the vermilion area it is now finally getting catfish bigger than 14 inches I think raising the limit is going to ruin the fishery we now have.

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** Flathead catfish

**From:** [Thomas.VanKley@mutualofomaha.com](mailto:Thomas.VanKley@mutualofomaha.com) [<mailto:Thomas.VanKley@mutualofomaha.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, October 06, 2014 1:38 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Flathead catfish

To whom it may concern;

I have noticed the proposed changes in Flathead catfish daily limits on S.D./Nebraska border waters, which I am a huge advocate for. However, wouldn't it make sense to include the James River along with the Big Sioux river in these proposed changes? Taking 10 flatheads (15 on the Sioux) of any size, off of these tributaries does not allow for a sustainable population. (there is no research to support otherwise). The river systems have noticed a decline in catfish population as it is. Would it not make sense to include the harvesting of only 1 fish over 24". Neighboring states implement the 1 over rule and it has allowed for both a harvesting opportunity and a trophy fish opportunity. In fact, the 3 previous studies done by Nebraska officials, (the most recent survey ending in 2009, recommended ANY fish over 19 inches would need to be released to sustain healthy Flathead populations on the 59-mile unchannelized stretch of the Missouri River.) What would make the James and the Sioux rivers any different, they arguably receive more fishing pressure. South Dakota needs to get proactive here and make changes that will improve the trophy angling opportunities, as well as, continued harvest opportunities, on our river systems.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to hearing back from you!

Tom Van Kley  
Sioux Falls, SD 57106

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: finalization of spearing northern an catfish year around..

**From:** [jgruber148@yahoo.com](mailto:jgruber148@yahoo.com) [<mailto:jgruber148@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 21, 2014 8:54 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** finalization of spearing northern an catfish year around..

why would you want to liberalize and destroy a strong fishery? we all know northern pike are an exceptionally easy target when they are making their spawning run after ice out.. what will happen is the lakes will only be filled with hammer handle pike of the one to two lb. class. all the mature females will be wiped out in the spring..

leave well enough alone, we have a strong fishery, and what is not broken does not need fixing.. jim gruber  
148 sunset park drive, Estelline, s.d. 57234 605 873 2017

Sent from Windows Mail

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Sent:** Monday, November 03, 2014 11:10 PM  
**To:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Subject:** Comment on : GFP 2014 October Proposals - 2014 November Finals

Name: martin larsen

Address: 805 Dakota ave

City: hurley

State: sd

Zip: 57036

Email: [martydlarsen@gmail.com](mailto:martydlarsen@gmail.com)

Phone: 6052612811

Comment: As you are concedering changing the fees for elk etc. have you thought about changing the lottery for the tags so you can get the preference points down? You have some with a lot of points and some that draw a tag with very few points. is that rite ?